A Kernel Independence Test for Random Processes

Kacper Chwialkowski KACPER.CHWIALKOWSKI@GMAIL.COM
University College London, Computer Science Department

Arthur Gretton ARTHUR.GRETTON@GMAIL.COM
University College London, Gatsby Computational Neuroscience Unit

arXiv:1402.4501v1 [stat.ML] 18 Feb 2014

Abstract

A new non parametric approach to the problem of testing the independence of two random process is developed. The test statistic is the Hilbert Schmidt Independence Criterion (HSIC), which was used previously in testing independence for i.i.d pairs of variables. The asymptotic behaviour of HSIC is established when computed from samples drawn from random processes. It is shown that earlier bootstrap procedures which worked in the i.i.d. case will fail for random processes, and an alternative consistent estimate of the p-values is proposed. Tests on artificial data and real-world Forex data indicate that the new test procedure discovers dependence which is missed by linear approaches, while the earlier bootstrap procedure returns an elevated number of false positives.

1. Introduction

Measures of statistical dependence between a pair of random variables (X, Y) are well established, and have been applied in a wide variety of areas, including fitting causal networks (Pearl, 2001), discovering features which have significant dependence on a label set (Song et al., 2012), and independent component analysis (Hyvärinen et al., 2001). Where pairs of observations are independent and identically distributed, a number of non-parametric tests of independence have been developed (A., 1993; Gretton et al., 2008b; Székely & Rizzo, 2009; Gretton & Gyorfi, 2010), which determine whether the dependence measure is large enough to be statistically significant. These non-parametric tests are guaranteed to be consistent against any fixed alternative - they make no assumptions as to the nature of the dependence.

For a great number of data analysis tasks, however, the observations being tested are from a time series: each observation is dependent on its past values. Examples include audio signals, financial data, and brain activity. Given two such random processes, we propose a hypothesis test of instantaneous dependence, of whether the two signals are dependent at a particular time t. Our test satisfies two important properties: it is consistent against any fixed alternatives, and it is nonparametric - we do not assume the dependence takes a particular form (such as linear correlation), or require parametric models of the time series. We further avoid making use of density estimation as an intermediate step, so as to avoid the assumption that the distributions have densities (for instance, when dealing with text or other structured data).

We use as our test statistic the Hilbert-Schmidt Independence Criterion (HSIC) (Gretton et al., 2005; 2008b), which can be represented as the distance between embeddings of the joint distribution and the product of the marginals in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) (Gretton et al., 2012, Section 7). When characteristic RKHSs are used, the population HSIC is zero iff the variables are independent (Sriperumbudur et al., 2008). Under the null hypothesis of independence, $P_{XY} = P_X P_Y$, the minimum variance estimate of HSIC is a degenerate U-statistic. The distribution of the empirical HSIC under the null is an infinite sum of independent χ^2 variables (Gretton et al., 2008b), which follows directly from e.g. (Serfling, 2002, Ch. 5). In practice, given a sample $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$ of pairs of variables drawn from P_{XY}, the null distribution is approximated by a bootstrap procedure, where a histogram is obtained by computing the test statistic on many different permutations $\{x_i, y_{\pi(i)}\}_{i=1}^n$, to decouple X and Y.

In the case where the samples $Z_t = (X_t, Y_t)$ are drawn from a random process, the analysis of the asymptotic behaviour of HSIC requires substantially more effort than the i.i.d. case. As our main contribution, we obtain both the null and alternative distributions of HSIC for random processes, where the null distribution is defined as X_t being

independent of Y_t at time t. Such a test may be used for finding casual effects (i.e., whether one signal is dependent on the values of another signal at a particular delay) or instant coupling (see our first experiment in Section 4.2).[1] The null distribution is again an infinite weighted sum of χ^2 variables, however these are now correlated, rather than independent. Under the alterntive hypothesis, the statistic has an asymptotically normal distribution.

For the test to be used in practice, we require an empirical estimate of the null distribution, which gives the correct test threshold when $Z_t = (X_t, Y_t)$ is a random process. Evidently, the bootstrap procedure used in the i.i.d. case is incorrect, as the dependence structure within the Y_t variables will be removed. This turns out to cause severe problems in practice, as the permutation procedure will give an increasing rate of false positives as the dependence between the Y_t increases (i.e., dependence will be detected between X_t and Y_t, even though none exists; this is also known as a Type I error). Instead, our null estimate is obtained by making shifts of one signal relative to the other, so as to preserve the dependence structure within each signal. Consequently, we are able to keep the Type I error at the design level $\alpha = 0.05$. In our experiments, we address three examples: one artificial case consisting of two signals which are dependent but have no linear correlation, and two real-world examples on Forex data. HSIC for random processes reveals dependencies that classical approaches fail to detect, and our new approach moreover gives the correct Type I error rate, whereas a bootstrap-based approach designed for i.i.d. signals returns too many false positives.

Related work Prior work on testing independence in time series may be categorized in two branches: testing serial dependence within a single time series, and testing dependence between one time series and another. The case of serial dependence turns out to be relatively straightforward, as under the null hypothesis, the samples become independent: thus, the analysis reduces to the i.i.d. case. Pinkse (1998); Diks & Panchenko (2005) provide a quadratic forms function-based serial dependence test which employs the same statistic as HSIC. Due to the simple form of the null hypothesis, the analysis of (Serfling, 2002, Ch. 5) applies. Further work in the context of the serial dependency testing includes simple approaches based on rank statistics e.g. Spearman's correlation or Kendall's tau, correlation integrals e.g. (Broock et al., 1996); criteria based on integrated squared distance between densities e.g (Rosenblatt & Wahlen, 1992); KL-divergence based criteria e.g. (Robinson, 1991; Hong & White, 2004); and generalizations of KL-divergence to so called q-class entropies e.g. (Clive W. J. Granger, 2004; Racine & Maasoumi, 2007).

In most of the tests of independence of two time series, specific conditions have been enforced, e.g that processes follow a moving average specification or the dependence is linear. Prior work in the context of dependency tests of two time series includes cross covariance based tests e.g. (Haugh, 1976; Hong, 1996; Shao, 2009); and a Generalized Association Measure based criterion (Fadlallah et al., 2012). Some work has been undertaken in the nonparametric case, however. A nonparametric measure of independence for time series, based on the Hilbert Schmidt Independence criterion, was proposed by Smola (2008). While this work established the convergence in probability of the statistic to its population value, no asymptotic distributions were obtained, and the statistic was not used in hypothesis testing. To our knowledge, the only nonparametric independence test for pairs of time series is due to Besserve et al. (2013), which addresses the harder problem of testing independence across all time lags simultaneously. The procedure is to compute the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of a cross-spectral density operator (the Fourier transform of the covariance operator at each time lag). The resulting statistic is a function of frequency, and must be zero at all frequencies for independence, so a correction for multiple hypothesis testing is required. It is not clear how the asymptotic analysis used in the present work would apply to this statistic, and this remains an interesting topic of future study.

The remaining material is organized as follows. In Section 2 we provide a brief introduction to random processes and various mixing conditions, and an expression for our independence statistic, HSIC. In Section 3, we characterize the asymptotic behaviour of HSIC for random variables with temporal dependence, under the null and alternative hypotheses, and establish the test consistency. We propose an empirical procedure for constructing a statistical test, and demonstrate that the earlier bootstrap approach will not work for our case. Section 4 provides experiments on synthetic and real data.

2. Background

In this section we introduce necessary definitions referring to random processes. We then go on to define a V-statistic estimate of the Hilbert-Schmidt Independence Criterion, which applies in the i.i.d. case.

Random process. Firstly we introduce the necessary probabilistic framework to work with a pair of time series. Let $(Z_t, \mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a stationary sequence of random variables defined on a probability space Ω with a probability measure P and natural filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$. Further assume that Z_t denotes a pair of random variables i.e. $Z_t = (X_t, Y_t)$. Each Z_t takes values in a measurable Polish space $(\mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Z}), P_{\mathbf{Z}})$. Space $\mathbf{Z}$ is a Cartesian product of

[1] We distinguish our case from the problem of ensuring time series are independent simultaneously across all time lags, e.g the null will hold even if $X_t = Y_{t-1}$ and Y_t is white noise.

two Polish spaces $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$, endowed with a natural Borel set and an induced probability measure.

We introduce sequence of independent copies of Z_0 i.e. $(Z_t^*)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$. Since Z_t is stationary, Z_t^* preserves the dependence between random variables X_t and Y_t, but breaks the temporal dependence.

Next, we formalize a concept of memory of a process. A process is called absolutely regular (β-mixing) if $\beta(m) \to 0$, where

$$\beta(m) = \frac{1}{2} \sup_n \sup \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} |P(A_i \cap B_j) - P(A_i)P(B_j)|.$$

The second supremum in the $\beta(m)$ definition is taken over all pairs of finite partitions $\{A_1, \cdots, A_I\}$ and $\{B_1, \cdots, B_J\}$ of the sample space such that $A_i \in \mathcal{A}_1^n$ and $B_j \in \mathcal{A}_{n+m}^{\infty}$ and $\mathcal{A}_b^c$ is a sigma filed spanned by a subsequence, $\mathcal{A}_b^c = \sigma(Z_b, Z_{b+1}, ..., Z_c)$. A process is called uniform mixing (ϕ-mixing) if $\phi(m) \to 0$, where

$$\phi(m) = \sup_n \sup_{A\in\mathcal{A}_1^n} \sup_{B\in\mathcal{A}_{n+m}^{\infty}} |P(B|A) - P(B)|.$$

Uniform mixing implies absolute regularity, i.e. $\beta(m) \leq \phi(m)$ (Bradley, 2005).

Under technical assumptions, Autoregressive Moving Average processes — or more generally Markov Chains — are absolutely regular or uniformly mixing (Doukhan, 1994).

Hilbert Schmidt Independence Criterion Let k, l be positive definite characteristic kernels (Sriperumbudur et al., 2008): this is to say that mappings of probability measures to the corresponding RKHSs are injective. We assume the kernels k and l are bounded and continuous. Denote a group of permutations over 4 elements by S_4, and let π be its element, i.e., a permutation of four elements. We define a symmetric function h

$$h(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) = \frac{1}{4!} \sum_{\pi\in S_4} [k(x_{\pi(1)}, x_{\pi(2)})l(y_{\pi(1)}, y_{\pi(2)}) + k(x_{\pi(1)}, x_{\pi(2)})l(y_{\pi(3)}, y_{\pi(4)}) - 2k(x_{\pi(1)}, x_{\pi(2)})l(y_{\pi(2)}, y_{\pi(3)})].$$

Lemma 1. *Let γ be an expected value of the function h, $\gamma = \mathcal{E}h(Z_1^*, Z_2^*, Z_3^*, Z_4^*)$. This is value of the Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion, computed using a function symmetric in its arguments. γ is equal to zero if and only if null hypothesis holds.*

The value of the γ corresponds to a distance between embeddings of (X_1^*, Y_2^*) and (X_1^*, Y_1^*) (Gretton et al., 2012, Section 7). A biased empirical estimate of the Hilbert Schmidt Independence Criterion can be expressed as a V-statistic (the unbiased estimate is a U-statistic, however the difference will be accounted for when constructing a hypothesis test, through appropriate construction of the null distribution).

V statistics. A V-statistic of a k-argument, symmetric function f is written

$$V(f, Z) = \frac{1}{n^k} \sum_{1\leq i_1,\cdots,i_k\leq n} f(Z_{i_1}, ..., Z_{i_k}). \quad (1)$$

The behaviour of the aforementioned statistic depends on the degeneracy of the function that defines it. We say that a k-argument, symmetric function f is j-degenerate ($j < k$) if for each $z_1, \cdots, z_j \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\mathcal{E}f(z_1, \cdots, z_j, Z_{j+1}^*, \cdots, Z_k^*) = 0.$$

If $j = k - 1$ we say that the function is canonical. We refer to a normalized V statistic as the V-statistic multiplied by the sample size, $n \cdot \gamma$.

3. Hilbert Schmidt Independence Criterion for random processes

In this section we construct the Hilbert Schmidt Independence Criterion for random processes, and define its asymptotic behaviour. We then introduce a testing procedure for time series.

We introduce two hypotheses: the null hypothesis $\mathbf{H_0}$ that X_t and Y_t are independent, and the alternative hypothesis $\mathbf{H_1}$ that they are dependent. To build a statistical test based on $n \cdot \gamma$ we need two main results. First, if null hypothesis holds, we show $n \cdot \gamma$ converges to a random variable. Second, if the null hypothesis does not hold, $n \cdot \gamma$ estimator diverges to infinity. Following these results, the Type I error (the probability of mistakenly rejecting the null hypothesis when the variables are independent) will stabilize at the design parameter α, and the Type II error (the probability of mistakenly accepting the null hypothesis when the variables are dependent) will drop to zero, as the sample size increases.

We begin by introducing an auxiliary kernel function s, and characterize the normalized V-statistic distribution of s using a CLT introduced by (I. S. Borisov, 2009). We then show that the normalized V-statistic associated with the function s has the same asymptotic distribution as the $n \cdot \gamma$ distribution.

Let s be an auxiliary function

$$s(z_1, z_2) = \tilde{k}(x_1, x_2)\tilde{l}(y_1, y_2),$$

where $z \in \mathbf{Z}, x \in \mathbf{X}, y \in \mathbf{Y}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{k}(x_1, x_2) =& k(x_1, x_2) - \mathcal{E}k(x_1, X_2) \\ & - \mathcal{E}k(X_1^*, x_2) + \mathcal{E}k(X_1^*, X_2^*), \\ \tilde{l}(y_1, y_2) =& l(y_1, y_2) - \mathcal{E}l(y_1, Y_2) \\ & - \mathcal{E}l(Y_1^*, y_2) + \mathcal{E}l(Y_1^*, Y_2^*).\end{aligned}$$

Both $\tilde{k}$ and $\tilde{l}$ are kernels, since they are dot products between features centred in their respective RKHSs Gretton et al. (2008a, Appendix B.1.). Therefore $s = \tilde{k} \cdot \tilde{l}$ defines a kernel on a product space of pairs Z_t. Using Mercer's Theorem we obtain an expansion for s,

Statement 1. *By Steinwart & Scovel (2012) Corollary 3.5, the bounded, continuous kernel s has a representation* [2]

$$s(z_a, z_b) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i e_i(z_a) e_i(z_b) \tag{2}$$

where $(e_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ denotes an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Z}), P_{\mathbf{Z}})$. The series $(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_j \ e_i(z_a)e_i(z_b))$ converges absolutely (which implies absolute convergence of $\sum_i^{\infty} \lambda_i$ series) and uniformly. e_i are eigenfunctions of s and λ_i are eigenvalues of s.

From now on we will assume that for every collection of pairwise distinct subscripts (i_1, i_2), the distribution of (Z_{i_1}, Z_{i_2}) is absolutely continuous with respect to the $(Z_{j_1}^*, Z_{j_2}^*)$ distribution. This assumption prevents the occurrence of degenerate cases, such that all Z_i being the same. The following three results are proved in Section 5.1.

Lemma 2. *Let the process Z_t have a mixing coefficient smaller than m^{-3} $(\beta(m), \phi(m) \leq m^{-3})$ and satisfy either of the following conditions:*

A *Z_t is ϕ-mixing.*

B *Z_t is β-mixing. For some $\epsilon > 0$ and for an even number $c \geq 2$ the following holds*

1. *$\sup_i \mathcal{E}|e_i(X_1)|^{2+\epsilon} \leq \infty$, where $e_i(X_1)$ are basis introduced in 2.*
2. *$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \beta^{\epsilon/(2+\epsilon)}(m) < \infty$.*

If the null hypothesis holds, then s is a canonical function and a kernel. What is more,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} n \cdot V(s, Z) \stackrel{D}{=} \sum_{j}^{\infty} \lambda_j \tau_j^2,$$

where τ_j is a centred Gaussian sequence with the covariance matrix

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}\tau_a\tau_b = & \mathcal{E}e_a(Z_1)e_b(Z_1) + \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left[\mathcal{E}e_a(Z_1)e_b(Z_{j+1}) + \mathcal{E}e_b(Z_1)e_a(Z_{j+1})\right].\end{aligned}$$

We now characterize the asymptotics of γ.

Theorem 1. *Under assumptions of Lemma 2, if $\mathbf{H_0}$ holds then the asymptotic distribution of γ is the same as the distribution of a V statistic associated with s,*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} n \cdot V(h, Z) \stackrel{D}{=} \lim_{n \to \infty} n \cdot V(s, Z).$$

Theorem 2. *Under assumptions of the Lemma 2, if $\mathbf{H_1}$ holds then $\gamma > 0$ and $\sqrt{n}(V(h, Z) - \gamma)$ has asymptotically normal distribution with mean zero and some finite variance.*

Consequently, if the null hypothesis does not hold then $P(n \cdot V(h, Z) > C) \to 1$ for any fixed C. Finally, we show that the γ estimator is easy to compute. According to Gretton et al. (2008b, equation 4) ,

$$V(h, Z) = \frac{1}{n^2} trHKHL,$$

where $K_{ab} = k(X_a, X_b)$, $L_{ab} = l(Y_a, Y_b)$,$H_{ij} = \delta_{ij} - n^{-1}$ and n is a sample size.

Testing procedure We begin by showing that the H_0 distribution of γ obtained via the bootstrap approach of (Diks & Panchenko, 2005; Gretton et al., 2008b) gives an incorrect p-value estimate when used with independent random processes. In fact, the null hypothesis obtained by permutation is that the two processes are *both* i.i.d *and* independent from each other. Recall the covariance structure of the γ estimator from Theorem 1,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}\tau_a\tau_b = & \mathcal{E}e_a(Z_1)e_b(Z_1) + \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left[\mathcal{E}e_a(Z_1)e_b(Z_{j+1}) + \mathcal{E}e_b(Z_1)e_a(Z_{j+1})\right].\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We can represent e_a and e_b as $e_a(z) = e_u^X(x)e_o^Y(y)$, $e_b(z) = e_i^X(x)e_p^Y(y)$, as a decomposition of the $\mathbf{Z}$ basis into bases of $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}$ respectively. Consider partial a sum T_n of infinite sums from the aboves equation (3), with X_t replaced with its permutation $X_{\pi(t)}$,

$$T_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathcal{E}e_u^X(X_{\pi(1)})e_i^X(X_{\pi(j+1)})\mathcal{E}e_o^Y(Y_1)e_p^Y(Y_{j+1}). \tag{4}$$

[2] A bounded kernel is compactly embedded into $L^2(\mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Z}), P_{\mathbf{Z}})$ (Steinwart & Scovel, 2012)

Using covariance inequalities (Doukhan, 1994, Section 1.2.2) we conclude that $\mathcal{E}e_o^Y(Y_1)e_p^Y(Y_{j+1}) = O(m(j))$ and $\mathcal{E}e_u^X(X_\pi(1))e_i^X(X_\pi(j+1)) = O(m(|\pi(j) - \pi(1)|)^{\frac{1}{2}})$ where m is an appropriate mixing coefficient (β or ϕ). Recall that $0 < m(j) < Cj^{-3}$.

We can therefore reduce the problem to the convergence of a random variable

$$S_n = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} m_j^{\frac{1}{2}} m_{|\pi(j)-\pi(1)|}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{5}$$

where π is a random permutation drawn from the uniform distribution over the set of n-element permutations. In the supplementary material we show that this sum converges in probability to zero at rate $O(n^{-1})$, for sample size n.

Since $S_n > T_n > 0$, then T_n converges to zero in probability, and consequently the covariance matrix $\mathcal{E}\tau_a\tau_b \xrightarrow{P} 0$ for $b \neq a$ and coverages to unity for $a = b$. Indeed, the expected value $\mathcal{E}e_a((X_{\pi(1)}, Y_1))e_b((X_{\pi(1)}, Y_1)) = 0$ if $a \neq b$ and is equal to one otherwise. Note that this is the covariance matrix described in Gretton et al. (2008a).

A correct approach to approximating the asymptotic null distribution of $n \cdot V(h, Z)$ under $\mathbf{H}_0$ is by *shifting* of the time series relative to the other. Define the shifted process $S_t^c = Y_{t+c \bmod n}$ for an integer $c, 0 \leq c \leq n$ and $0 \leq t \leq n$. If we let c vary over $0 \leq A \leq B \leq n$ for A such that the dependence between Y_{t+A} and X_t is negligible, then we can approximate the null distribution with an empirical distribution calculated on points $(V(h, Z^k))_{A \leq k \leq B}$, where $Z_t^k = (X_t, S_t^k)$. This is due to the fact that the shifted process S_t^c preservers most of the dependence. We call this method Shift HSIC. In the supplementary material we show that Shift HSIC samples from the right distribution.

4. Experiments

In the experiments we compare our Shift HSIC with the Bootstrap HSIC of (Gretton et al., 2008b). We conduct three experiments: an artificial dataset, where two time series are coupled nonlinearly; and two forex datasets, where in one case we investigate residual dependence when one time series has been used to linearly predict another, and in the other case, we reveal strong dependencies between signals that are not seen via linear correlation.

4.1. Artificial data

Nonlinear dependence. We investigate two dependent, autoregressive random processes X_t,Y_t, specified by

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= aX_{t-1} + \epsilon_t, \\ Y_t &= aY_{t-1} + \eta_t, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Algorithm 1 Generate innovations

Input: extinction rate $0 \leq p \leq 1$
repeat
  Initialize η_t, ϵ_t to $N(0, 1)$ and d to a number uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$.
  if $\eta_t^2 + \epsilon_t^2 > 0.5$ **or** $d > p$ **then**
    return η_t, ϵ_t
  end if
until true

with an autoregressive component a equal to 0.2. The coupling of the processes is a result of the dependence in the innovations ϵ_t, η_t. These ϵ_t, η_t are drawn from an Extinct Gaussian distribution, defined by the Algorithm 1. The parameter p (called extinction rate) controls how often a point drawn form a ball $B(0, 0.5)$ dies off. According to Algorithm 1, the probability of seeing a point inside the ball $B(0, 0.5)$ is different than for a two dimensional Gaussian $N(\mathbf{0}, Id)$. On the other hand, as p goes to zero, the Extinct Gaussian converges in distribution to $N(\mathbf{0}, Id)$. Figure 1 provides an intuition how does the X_t, Y_t join distribution look like. The left scatter plot in the Figure 1 presents X_t and Y_t generated with the extinction rate 50%, while the right hand plot is generated with the extinction rate 99.87%.

Figure 2 compares the power of the Shift HSIC test and the correlation test. The X axis is indexed by an extinction rate, while the Y axis shows the true positive rate. Shift HSIC is capable of detecting non-linear dependence between X_t and Y_t, which is missed by linear correlation.

False positive rates. We next investigate the rate of false positives for Shift HSIC and Bootstrap HSIC on independent copies of the $AR(1)$ processes used in the previous experiment. To generate independent processes, we first sample two pairs (X_t, Y_t), (X'_t, Y'_t) of time series using specification (6) and then construct Z by taking X from the first pair and Y from the second, i.e., $Z_t = (X_t, Y'_t)$. We set an extinction rate to 50%.

The AR component a in the model (6) controls the memory of a processes - the larger this component, the longer the memory. We perform the Shift HSIC and the Bootstrap HSIC tests on Z_t generated under $\mathbf{H_0}$ with different AR components. Figure 3 presents the results of this experiment. The X axis is indexed by the AR component and Y axis shows the false positive rate. As the temporal dependence increases, the Bootstrap HSIC incorrectly gives an increasing number of false positives: thus, it cannot be relied on to detect dependence in time series. The Shift HSIC false positive rate remains at the 5% p-value level.



Figure 1. X_t and Y_t, described in the Experiment 4.1, with extinction rates 50% and 99.8% respectively.



Figure 2. True positive rate for the Shift HSIC, the Bootstrap and correlation based test.

4.2. Forex data

We use Foreign Exchange Market quotes to evaluate Shift HSIC performance on the real life data. Practitioners point out that FOREX time series are noisy and hard to handle, especially at low granulations (smaller then 15 minutes). We decided to work with FOREX time series to show that Shift HSIC can detect dependence even on such a difficult dataset.

The FOREX time series were granulated to obtain two minute sampling (the granulation function returned last price in the two minute window). Using the test of Diks & Panchenko (2005), we checked that serial dependence of the differentiated time series decays fast enough to satisfy the assumed mixing conditions. By a differentiated time series we understand $(X_t - X_{t-1})_{t\in\mathbf{N}}$. The choice of the pairs and the trading day, 21st January 2013, were arbitrary.

Instantaneous coupling and causal effect. Having one australian dollar we may obtain a quantity of yen in two ways, either by using AUD/JPY exchange rate explicitly



Figure 3. False positive rate for the Shift HSIC and the Bootstrap HSIC.

or by buying canadian dollars and then selling them at the CAD/JPY rate. Let X_t be a differentiated AUD/JPY exchange rate and Y_t be a differentiated product of exchange rates AUD/CAD×CAD/JPY. We will investigate the relation between these two. Common sense dictates that Y_t should behave similarly to X_t. After examining the cross-correlation of X_t and Y_t, we propose a simple regression model to describe the interaction between the signals,

$$\hat{Y}_t = a_0 X_t + a_1 X_{t-1} + \cdots + a_6 X_{t-6}.$$

We fit the model and see that $a_0 = 0.97$, and the remaining coefficients are not bigger then 0.06 in absolute value. This suggest that most of the dependence is explained by an instantaneous coupling. We further investigate the cross-correlation between residuals $R_t = Y_t - \hat{Y}_t$ and X_t. We observe no significant correlations in the first 30 lags.

We next perform a sanity check using HSIC methods, to see whether the linear model suit the data. We calculate p-values for the Bootstrap HSIC and the Shift HSIC for the first 30 lags, i.e., we calculate $nV(h, Z^k)$ for $k \in (0, \cdots, 30)$, where Z^k is shifted process defined in the previous section. We discover dependence only at lags 4, 5, 9, 13 and 29, as presented in Figure 4. This strongly supports the proposition that the instantaneous coupling between X_t and Y_t is of a linear type. However, both the Bootstrap HSIC and the Shift HSIC support the hypothesis that there is a strong relation at lag 5, which is not explained well by the linear model.

The questions remains whether test statistics at lags 4, 9, 13 and 29 indicate further model misspecification. Under $\mathbf{H_0}$, at a significance level 94%, we expect 1.8 out of 30 statistics to be higher than the 94% quantile. Excluding the statistic at lag 5, the Shift HSIC reports two statistics above



Figure 4. Goodness of fit of the model explained in the instantaneous coupling experiment.



Figure 5. Differences between the dependence structure on the FOREX revealed by the Shift HSIC and covariance.

the quantile, while Bootstrap HSIC reports four. Should the statistics at the different lags be independent from each other, the probabilities of seeing two and four statistics above the quantile are respectively 25% and 6.16%. Shift HSIC indicates that the model fits the data well, while the Bootstrap HSIC suggests that some non-linear dependencies remain unexplained.

Dependence structure. The data are five currency pairs. Correlation based independence test and Shift HSIC were performed on each pair of currencies. The dependencies revealed by those tests are depicted in Figure 5 - nodes represent the time series and edges represent dependence. Shift HSIC reveals a strong coupling between EUR/RUB and USD/JPY, HKD/JPY and XAU/USD that was not found by simple correlation. All edges revealed by Shift HSIC have p-values at most at level 0.3 - clearly, the Shift HSIC managed to find a strong non-linear dependence. Note that the obtained graphs are cliques, which is consistent with the dependence being a transitive relation.

5. Proofs

A U-statistic of a k-argument, symmetric function f, is the following statistic

$$U(f,Z) = \binom{n}{k}^{-1} \sum_{1\leq i_1<\cdots<i_k\leq n} f(Z_{i_1},...,Z_{i_k})$$

A decomposition due to Hoeffding allows us to decompose this U-statistic into a sum of U-statistics of canonical functions, $U(h,Z) = \sum_{k=1}^{4} \binom{4}{k} U(h_k,Z)$ where $h_k(z_1,...,z_l)$ are components of the decomposition. According to Serfling (2002, section 5.1.5), each of h_1,h_2,h_3,h_4 are symmetric and canonical. Note that h_k are defined using independent samples Z^* -this is due to the fact that CLT or LLN often state that U-statistics or V-statistics of mixing processes converge to their expected value taken with respect to independent copies, i.e., Z^*. Under $\mathbf{H}_0$, h_1 is equal to zero everywhere and $h_2 = \frac{1}{6}s$. This results were obtained by Gretton et al. (2008b) [3]. See supplementary for the details concerning above statements.

In order to characterize $U(f,Z)$ we show that under null hypothesis $U(h_2,Z)$ converges to a random variable, and both $U(h_3,Z)$,$U(h_4,Z)$ converge to zero in a probability. The proof that $U(h_4,Z)$ and $U(h_3,Z)$ convergence to zero can be found in the supplementary. Bellow we characterise $U(h_2,Z)$ convergence.

Lemma 3. *Under assumptions of Lemma 2,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n\cdot U(h_2,Z) \stackrel{D}{=} \frac{1}{6}\sum_{i_1}^{\infty} \lambda_{i_1}(\tau_{i_1}^2 - 1).$$

Proof. First recall that under null hypothesis $h_2 = \frac{1}{6}s$. We will check conditions of the Theorem 1 from I. S. Borisov (2009) [4].

Firstly, from Mercers Theorem by Steinwart & Scovel (2012) Corollary 3.5 we deduce that h_2 coefficients in $L_2(\mathbf{Z},\mathcal{B}_\mathbf{Z},P_\mathbf{Z})$ are absolutely summable. In the supplementary we show that $\mathcal{E}e_i(Z_1^*) = 0$.

Recall assumptions of Lemma 2. If **A** holds then $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\phi(k)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$ and $\sup_i \mathcal{E}|e_i(X_1)|^2 = 1 < \infty$. Finally, if **B** holds then process Z_t is α-mixing. Rest of the assumptions concerning uniform mixing in I. S. Borisov

[3] The second result is hard to locate - it is in appendix A.2, text between equation 12 and 13

[4] also available in the supplementary

(2009) is exactly the same as in this lemma.

□

5.1. Main body proofs

Proof. of Lemma 2. We use the fact that h_2 is equal to s up to scaling ($h_2 = \frac{1}{6}s$) and Lemma 3 to see that $nU(s,Z) \xrightarrow{D} \sum_i^\infty \lambda_i(\tau_i^2 - 1)$. Next we see that $\mathcal{E}s(Z_t, Z_t) = \mathcal{E}\sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i e_i(Z_t)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i$. Using the law of large numbers for mixing processes, we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_i^n s(Z_i, Z_i) \stackrel{P}{=} \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i \tag{7}$$

Using the following relationship between U and V we obtain the required result,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} nV(h,Z) \stackrel{D}{=} \lim_{n\to\infty} nU(h,Z) + \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_i^n s(Z_i,Z_i) \stackrel{D}{=}$$
$$\stackrel{D}{=} \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i + \sum_i^\infty \lambda_i(\tau_i^2 - 1) \stackrel{D}{=} \sum_i^\infty \lambda_i \tau_i^2.$$

□

Proof. of Theorem 1. We operate under null hypothesis. Recall that $U(h,Z)$ may be written $U(h,Z) = \sum_{k=1}^4 \binom{4}{k} U(h_k, Z)$. Here $h_1 \equiv 0$. We showed in the supplementary that $n \cdot \bar{h}_3(Z_t)$ and $n \cdot \bar{h}_4(Z_t)$ tend to zero in a probability. Using Lemma 3 we see that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n \cdot \binom{4}{2} \cdot U(h_2, Z) \lim_{n\to\infty} nU(s,Z) \stackrel{D}{=} \sum_i^\infty \lambda_i(\tau_i^2 - 1) \tag{8}$$

We define an auxiliary symmetric function w,

$$w(z_1,z_2,z_3) = h(z_1,z_1,z_2,z_3) + h(z_1,z_2,z_2,z_3)$$
$$+ h(z_1,z_2,z_3,z_3) + (h(z_1,z_1,z_3,z_2) +$$
$$+ h(z_3,z_2,z_2,z_1) + h(z_2,z_1,z_3,z_3)).$$

It is obvious that $\mathcal{E}w(Z_1^*, Z_2^*, Z_3^*) = 6\mathcal{E}h(Z_1^*, Z_1^*, Z_2^*, Z_3^*)$. We consider the difference between unnormalized V and U statistics;

$$S_n = \sum_{1\le i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\le n} h(Z_{i_1},...,Z_{i_4}) - \sum_{i\in C_4} h(Z_{i_1},...,Z_{i_4})$$

where $\sum_{i\in C_m}$ denotes summation over all $\binom{n}{m}$ combinations of m distinct elements $\{i_1,\cdots,i_m\}$ from $\{1,\cdots,n\}$. The difference is equal to sum over 4-tuples with at least one pair of equal elements. We can choose such tuples in $\binom{4}{2} = 6$ ways. Observe that w covers choice of all these six tuples. Since for any $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbf{Z}$, $h(z_1,z_1,z_1,z_2) = 0$, then w is zero whenever more than two indexes are equal to each other. Therefore we can sum w over distinct indexes z_1, z_2, z_3.

$$S_n = \sum_{i\in C_3} w(Z_{i_1}, Z_{i_2}, Z_{i_3}).$$

We see that S_n is a U-statistic. Using the Central Limit Theorem for U-statistics Denker & Keller (1983), Theorem 1, point c, we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} S_n \stackrel{P}{=} 6\mathcal{E}h(Z_1^*, Z_1^*, Z_2^*, Z_3^*).$$

On the other hand, via the relation $h_2 = \frac{1}{6}s$ and the h_2 definition $\mathcal{E}s(Z_1^*, Z_1^*) = 6\mathcal{E}h(Z_1^*, Z_1^*, Z_2^*, Z_3^*)$ and therefore

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_i^n s(Z_i,Z_i) \stackrel{P}{=} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} S_n. \tag{9}$$

Finally, we rewrite S_n as

$$\sum_{1\le i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\le n} h(Z_{i_1},...,Z_{i_4}) = S_n + \sum_{i\in C_4} h(Z_{i_1},...,Z_{i_4}).$$

We normalize by $\frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)}$, and take the limit $n\to\infty$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n^4}{n(n-1)(n-2)} V(h,Z) \stackrel{D}{=}$$
$$= \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} S_n + (n-4)U(h,Z) \right).$$

We substitute (9) and (8) on the right hand side, and use equation (7) from Lemma 2 to replace $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_i^n s(Z_i,Z_i)$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n \cdot V(h,Z) \stackrel{D}{=}$$
$$\stackrel{D}{=} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_i^n s(Z_i,Z_i) + \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i,j}^n s(Z_i,Z_j) \stackrel{D}{=}$$
$$\stackrel{D}{=} \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i + \sum_i^\infty \lambda_i(\tau_i^2 - 1) \stackrel{D}{=} \sum_i^\infty \lambda_i \tau_i^2.$$

□

Proof. of Theorem 2. If null hypothesis does not hold $\gamma > 0$, (Gretton et al., 2005). In this case h is non-degenerate and we can use Denker & Keller (1983, Theorem 1, case c) to see that $\frac{\sqrt{n}}{4\sqrt{\sigma}}(V(h,Z) - \gamma) \sim N(0,1)$, where σ is some finite real number (see note bellow Theorem 1 Denker & Keller (1983) stating that in case (c) σ^2 is finite and note above Theorem 1 stating that $\sigma^2 = \lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1}\sigma_n^2$). □

Proof. of Lemma 1. We use Lemma 1 and Theorem 4 from Gretton et al. (2005) to show that $\mathcal{E}h(Z_1^*, Z_2^*, Z_3^*, Z_4^*) = 0$

if and only if (X_1^*, Y_1^*) has a product distribution. Since Z_1^* has the same distribution as Z_1 and Z_t has the same distribution as Z_1 we infer that X_t is independent from Y_t if and only if $\mathcal{E}h(Z_1^*, Z_2^*, Z_3^*, Z_4^*) = 0$. □

A. Supplementary

The subsections in the supplementary are in the same order as sections and subsections in the article. In particular n-th reference to the supplementary in the article is n-th subsection in the supplementary. Before we start, we cite Yoshihara (1976) Lemma 1 that is used in the sequel.

Lemma 4. *(Yoshihara, 1976) Let $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}+}$ be an absolutely regular process with a mixing coefficient $(\beta(n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}+}$. Let $(t_1, t_2, \cdot, t_l)$ be a non-decreasing l-tuple, and let j be an integer such that $2 \leq j \leq l$. Finally, let $g : \mathbb{R}^l \to \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function satisfying*

$$\left(\mathcal{E}|g(Z_{t_1}, \cdots, Z_{t_l})|^{1+\delta}\right) \leq M$$

for some $\delta > 0, M > 0$. Then,

$$\left|\mathcal{E}g(Z_{t_1}, \cdots, Z_{t_l}) - \mathcal{E}g(Z_{t_1}, \cdots, Z_{t_{j-1}}, Z^*_{t_j}, \cdots, Z^*_{t_l})\right| \leq 4M^{\frac{1}{1+\delta}}\beta(t_j - t_{j-1})^{\frac{\delta}{1+\delta}}.$$

Note that if a function g is symmetric then we can always reorder its arguments if necessary.

A.1. Testing procedure - convergence of S_n from the equation (5).

Let π be a permutation drawn from a uniform distribution overs set of n-element permutations. We will that the random variable

$$Q_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{i^3} \frac{1}{|\pi(1) - \pi(i)|^3}$$

converges to zero in probability at rate $O(n^{-1})$. Since $0 \leq S_n \leq Q_n$ then S_n converges to zero in probability at the same rate.

Lemma 5. $\mathcal{E}|\pi(1) - \pi(i)|^{-3} = O(n^{-1})$.

Proof. Let j be a positive integer smaller than n. Observe that the sum $\sum_i^n |j - i|^{-3}$ is finite

$$\sum_{i}^{n} |j - i|^{-3} \leq 2\sum_{i}^{n} i^{-3} \leq 2\zeta(3), \tag{10}$$

where $\zeta(\cdot)$ is the zeta Riemann function. Now expand an expected value $\mathcal{E}|\pi(1) - \pi(i)|^{-3}$ using a conditional expected value properties

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}|\pi(1) - \pi(i)|^{-3} = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{E}|j - \pi(i)|^{-3}|\pi(1) = j) = \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n}(\mathcal{E}|j - \pi(i)|^{-3}|\pi(1) = j) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n-1}|j - i|^{-3} \leq \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{n} 2\zeta(3) = 2\zeta(3)\frac{1}{n-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

□

Lemma 6. *If $k \neq j$ are positive integers smaller than n, then*

$$\mathcal{E}|\pi(k) - \pi(1)|^{-3}|\pi(j) - \pi(1)|^{-3} = O(\frac{1}{n}^2)$$

Proof. We will use the inequality (10) and properties of a conditional expected value.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}|\pi(k) - \pi(1)|^3|\pi(j) - \pi(1)|^{-3} = \mathcal{E}\left(\mathcal{E}|\pi(k) - a|^{-3}|\pi(j) - a|^{-3}\big|\pi(1) = a\right) = \\
&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{a=1}^{n}\left(\mathcal{E}|\pi(k) - a|^3|\pi(j) - a|^3\big|\pi(1) = a\right) = \frac{6}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{a\neq b, a\neq c, b\neq c}^{n} \frac{1}{|b-a|^3}\frac{1}{|c-a|^3} \leq \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{a\neq b}^{n} \frac{2\zeta(3)}{|b-a|^3} \leq \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{a}^{n} 4\zeta(3)^2 = \frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)} 4\zeta(3)^2 = O(\frac{1}{n}^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

□

Lemma 7. *Q_n converges to zero in probability. The convergence rate is $\frac{1}{n}$.*

Proof. Firstly, using Lemma 5 , we compute the expected value of Q_n

$$\mathcal{E}Q_n = \mathcal{E}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{i^3}\frac{1}{|\pi(1)-\pi(i)|^3} = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{i^3}\mathcal{E}\frac{1}{|\pi(1)-\pi(i)|^3} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{i^3}\frac{1}{n}C \leq \frac{1}{n}C\zeta(3) = O(\frac{1}{n}).$$

Next, using Lemma 6, we compute the second moment

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{1}{k^3}\frac{1}{|\pi(k)-\pi(1)|^3}\right)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1}{j^3}\frac{1}{|\pi(j)-\pi(1)|^3}\right) \leq \mathcal{E}\left(C\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{k\neq j}^{n}\frac{1}{k^3}\frac{1}{j^3}+\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{1}{k^6}\frac{1}{|\pi(k)-\pi(1)|^6}\right) = \\ \leq C\frac{1}{n^2}\zeta(3)^2 + C'\frac{1}{n}\zeta(6) = O(\frac{1}{n}).\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Using the Chebyshev's inequality we obtain the required result. □

A.2. Testing procedure - Shift HSIC samples from the right distribution

We will investigate the value of the $n\cdot\gamma$ estimator for the shifted process. Let us define Hilbert Schmidt norm for the shifted process

$$\gamma_k = \mathcal{E}h((X_1^*, Y_{1+k}^*),(X_2^*, Y_{2+k}^*),(X_3^*, Y_{3+k}^*),(X_4^*, Y_{4+k}^*)).$$

Note that in this notation $\gamma = \gamma_0$. Recall the definition of the shifted process Y i.e. $S_t^c = Y_{t+c \bmod n}$ and the the definition of shifted process Z $Z_t^k = (X_t, S_t^k)$ for a sample size n. We define γ_k estimator to be a V-statistic calculated on the shifted process Z^k i.e. $V(h, Z^k)$.

Suppose that null hypothesis holds. If X_t is independent from Y_{t+k} then γ_k estimator has the same distribution as γ estimator. Recall the covariance structure of $nV(h,Z)$ form the 1

$$\mathcal{E}\tau_a\tau_b = \mathcal{E}e_a(Z_1^k)e_b(Z_1^k) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left[\mathcal{E}e_a(Z_1^k)e_b(Z_{j+1}^k) + \mathcal{E}e_b(Z_1^k)e_a(Z_{j+1}^k)\right].$$

We represent e_a and e_b as $e_a(z) = e_u^X(x)e_o^Y(y)$, $e_b(z) = e_i^X(x)e_p^Y(y)$. It is a decomposition of $\mathbf{Z}$'s basis into basis of $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}$ respectively. Consider one of the above infinite sums with Y_t replaced with the shifted process S_t^k.

$$T_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathcal{E}e_a(Z_1^k)e_b(Z_{j+1}^k) = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathcal{E}e_u^X(X_1)e_i^X(X_{j+1})e_o^Y(S_1^k)e_p^Y(S_t^k), \tag{14}$$

we obtain the following $nV(h,Z^k)$ covariance structure

$$\begin{aligned}T_n &= \sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathcal{E}e_u^X(X_1)e_i^X(X_{j+1})\mathcal{E}e_o^Y(S_1^k)e_p^Y(S_t^k) = \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-k}\mathcal{E}e_u^X(X_1)e_i^X(X_{j+1})e_o^Y(Y_1^k)e_p^Y(Y_{j+1}^k) + \sum_{j=n-k}^{n}\mathcal{E}e_u^X(X_1)e_i^X(X_{j+1})\mathcal{E}e_o^Y(Y_{1+k})e_p^Y(Y_{1+(n-j)}) \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-k}\mathcal{E}e_u^X(X_1)e_i^X(X_{j+1})e_o^Y(Y_1)e_p^Y(Y_{j+1}) + O(k(n-k)^{-3}).\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

We have used Doukhan (1994, section 1.2.2) covariance inequalities and ours bounds on mixing coefficients to obtain $\mathcal{E}|e_u^X(X_1)e_i^X(X_{j+1})| \leq (n-k)^{-3}$. Then we used the fact that $\mathcal{E}e_o^Y(Y_{1+k})e_p^Y(Y_{1+(n-j)})$ is finite (e.g. Holders inequality). Observe that as n goes to infinity T_n converges to $\tau_a\tau_b$, since $\beta(n-k)C \to 0$.

A.3. Proofs - Hoeffding decoposition

Hoeffding decomposition (e.g. (Serfling, 2002)) allows to decompose U-statistics into sum of U-statistics that are sometimes easier to handle. In the following section we will perform Hoeffding decomposition of $U(h, Z)$ and investigate some of its properties. In the sequel we assume that k and l are bounded kernels.

Lemma 8. *$U(h, Z)$ allows representation*

$$U(h, Z) = \sum_{l=1}^{4} \binom{4}{l} U(h_l, Z)$$

where $h_k(z_1, ..., z_l)$ are defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
h_1(z_1) &= \mathcal{E}h(z_1, Z_2^*, Z_3^*, Z_4^*) \\
h_2(z_1, z_2) &= \mathcal{E}h(z_1, z_2, Z_3^*, Z_4^*) - h_1(z_1) - h_1(z_2) \\
h_3(z_1, z_2, z_3) &= \mathcal{E}h(z_1, z_2, z_3, Z_4^*) \\
&\quad - h_1(z_1) - h_1(z_2) - h_1(z_3) \\
&\quad - h_2(z_1, z_2) - h_2(z_1, z_3) - h_2(z_2, z_3) \\
h_4(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) &= h(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) \\
&\quad - h_1(z_1) - h_1(z_2) - h_1(z_3) - h_1(z_4) \\
&\quad - h_2(z_1, z_2) - h_2(z_1, z_3) - h_2(z_1, z_4) - h_2(z_2, z_3) - h_2(z_2, z_4) - h_2(z_3, z_4) \\
&\quad - h_3(z_1, z_2, z_3) - h_3(z_1, z_3, z_4) - h_3(z_1, z_2, z_4) - h_3(z_2, z_3, z_4)
\end{aligned}$$

We call this representation a Hoeffding decomposition. The proof was given by Hoeffding in (Hoeffding, 1961). We provide more detailed proof bellow.

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
4! \sum_{1 \le a < b < c < d \le n} h_1(z_a) &= (n-1)(n-2)(n-3) \sum_{1 \le a \le n} h(z_a) \\
4! \sum_{1 \le a < b < c < d \le n} h_2(z_a, z_b) &= \frac{1}{2!}(n-2)(n-3) \sum_{1 \le a < b \le n} h_2(z_a, z_b) \\
4! \sum_{1 \le a < b < c < d \le n} h_3(z_a, z_b, z_c) &= \frac{1}{3!}(n-3) \sum_{1 \le a < b < c \le n} h_3(z_a, z_b, z_c)
\end{aligned}$$

Put $S_m = \sum_{1 < i_1 < \cdots i_m < n} h_m(z_{i_1}, \cdots, z_{i_m})$. Now we are ready to expand S_4

$$\begin{aligned}
-\binom{4}{4}\binom{n}{4}^{-1} S_4 &= -\binom{n}{4}^{-1} \left[\frac{4}{1}(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)S_1 + \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{6}{2!}(n-2)(n-3)S_2 + \frac{4}{3!}(n-3)S_3 - S_4 \right] = \\
&\quad \frac{4}{n}S_1 + \frac{1}{2!}\frac{6}{n(n-1)}S_2 + \frac{1}{3!}\frac{4}{n(n-1)(n-2)}S_3 - U(h, Z) = \\
&\quad \binom{4}{1}\binom{n}{1}^{-1} S_1 + \binom{4}{2}\binom{n}{2}^{-1} S_2 + \binom{4}{3}\binom{n}{3}^{-1} S_3 - U(h, Z) = \\
&\quad \sum_{k=1}^{3} \binom{4}{k}\binom{n}{k}^{-1} S_k - U(h, Z).
\end{aligned}$$

What is the head of a postulated decomposition. Therefore

$$\sum_{k=1}^{4} \binom{4}{k}\binom{n}{k}^{-1} S_k = \sum_{k=1}^{3} \binom{4}{k}\binom{n}{k}^{-1} S_k + \binom{4}{4}\binom{n}{4}^{-1} S_4 = U(h, Z)$$

□

Corollary 1. *h_1,h_2,h_3,h_4 are symmetric.*

Lemma 9. *Under* $\mathbf{H_0}$, $\forall z \in \mathbf{Z}\ h_1(z) = 0$.

Proof. Let us use shorthand notation $k(a,b) \equiv k(x_a, x_b)$, $l(a,b) \equiv l(y_a, y_b)$. Using this notation

$$h(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) = \frac{1}{4!} \sum_{\pi \in S_4} k(\pi_1, \pi_2) \left[l(\pi_1, \pi_2) + l(\pi_3, \pi_4) - 2l(\pi_2, \pi_3) \right].$$

Let us expand this expression. By using k and l symmetry and writing arguments in lexicographical order we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&h(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) = \\
&k(a,b)\left(l(a,b) + l(c,d) - 2l(b,c)\right) + k(a,b)\left(l(a,b) + l(c,d) - 2l(b,d)\right) \\
&k(a,c)\left(l(a,c) + l(b,d) - 2l(b,c)\right) + k(a,c)\left(l(a,c) + l(b,d) - 2l(c,d)\right) + \\
&k(a,d)\left(l(a,d) + l(b,c) - 2l(b,d)\right) + k(a,d)\left(l(a,d) + l(b,c) - 2l(c,d)\right) + \\
&k(a,b)\left(l(a,b) + l(c,d) - 2l(a,c)\right) + k(a,b)\left(l(a,b) + l(c,d) - 2l(a,d)\right) + \\
&k(b,c)\left(l(b,c) + l(a,d) - 2l(a,c)\right) + k(b,c)\left(l(b,c) + l(a,d) - 2l(c,d)\right) + \\
&k(b,d)\left(l(b,d) + l(a,c) - 2l(a,d)\right) + k(b,d)\left(l(b,d) + l(a,c) - 2l(c,d)\right) + \\
&k(a,c)\left(l(a,c) + l(b,d) - 2l(a,b)\right) + k(a,c)\left(l(a,c) + l(b,d) - 2l(a,d)\right) + \\
&k(b,c)\left(l(b,c) + l(a,d) - 2l(a,b)\right) + k(b,c)\left(l(b,c) + l(a,d) - 2l(b,d)\right) + \\
&k(c,d)\left(l(c,d) + l(a,b) - 2l(a,d)\right) + k(c,d)\left(l(c,d) + l(a,b) - 2l(b,d)\right) + \\
&k(a,d)\left(l(a,d) + l(b,c) - 2l(a,b)\right) + k(a,d)\left(l(a,d) + l(b,c) - 2l(a,c)\right) + \\
&k(b,d)\left(l(b,d) + l(a,c) - 2l(a,b)\right) + k(b,d)\left(l(b,d) + l(a,c) - 2l(b,c)\right) + \\
&k(c,d)\left(l(c,d) + l(a,b) - 2l(a,c)\right) + k(c,d)\left(l(c,d) + l(a,b) - 2l(b,c)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By grouping brackets we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&h(z_a, z_b, z_c, z_d) = \\
&k(a,b)\left(2l(a,b) + 2l(c,d) - 2l(b,c) - 2l(b,d)\right) \\
&k(a,c)\left(2l(a,c) + 2l(b,d) - 2l(b,c) - 2l(c,d)\right) + \\
&k(a,d)\left(2l(a,d) + 2l(b,c) - 2l(b,d) - 2l(c,d)\right) + \\
&k(a,b)\left(2l(a,b) + 2l(c,d) - 2l(a,c) - 2l(a,d)\right) + \\
&k(b,c)\left(2l(b,c) + 2l(a,d) - 2l(a,c) - 2l(c,d)\right) + \\
&k(b,d)\left(2l(b,d) + 2l(a,c) - 2l(a,d) - 2l(c,d)\right) + \\
&k(a,c)\left(2l(a,c) + 2l(b,d) - 2l(a,b) - 2l(a,d)\right) + \\
&k(b,c)\left(2l(b,c) + 2l(a,d) - 2l(a,b) - 2l(b,d)\right) + \\
&k(c,d)\left(2l(c,d) + 2l(a,b) - 2l(a,d) - 2l(b,d)\right) + \\
&k(a,d)\left(2l(a,d) + 2l(b,c) - 2l(a,b) - 2l(a,c)\right) + \\
&k(b,d)\left(2l(b,d) + 2l(a,c) - 2l(a,b) - 2l(b,c)\right) + \\
&k(c,d)\left(2l(c,d) + 2l(a,b) - 2l(a,c) - 2l(b,c)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we introduce colours to picture grouping of terms that will cancel each other during integration.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&h(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) = \\
&\big[k(a,b)\,(4l(a,b) + 4l(c,d)) + k(a,c)\,(4l(a,c) + 4l(b,d)) + \\
&k(a,d)\,(4l(a,d) + 4l(b,c)) + k(b,c)\,(4l(b,c) + 4l(a,d)) + \\
&k(b,d)\,(4l(b,d) + 4l(a,c)) + k(c,d)\,(4l(c,d) + 4l(a,b))\big] + \\
&\big[k(a,b)(-2l(a,d) - 2l(a,c)) + k(a,b)(-2l(b,d) - 2l(b,c)) + \\
&k(a,c)(-2l(a,d) - 2l(a,b)) + k(a,c)(-2l(c,d) - 2l(b,c)) + \\
&k(a,d)(-2l(a,c) - 2l(a,b)) + k(a,d)(-2l(c,d) - 2l(b,d)) + \\
&k(b,c)(-2l(a,c) - 2l(a,b)) + k(b,c)(-2l(c,d) - 2l(b,d)) + \\
&k(b,d)(-2l(a,b) - 2l(a,d)) + k(b,d)(-2l(b,c) - 2l(c,d)) + \\
&k(c,d)(-2l(a,d) - 2l(a,c)) + k(c,d)(-2l(b,d) - 2l(b,c))\big]
\end{aligned}
\tag{16}
$$

We will show that brown terms of equation (16) cancel each other's. Recall that $h_1(z_1) = \mathcal{E}h(z_1, Z_2^*, Z_3^*, Z_4^*)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that we integrate with respect to all variables but x_a and y_a. Observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}k(x_a, X_b^*) = \mathcal{E}k(x_a, X_c^*) = \mathcal{E}k(x_a, X_d^*) \\
\mathcal{E}l(y_a, Y_b^*) = \mathcal{E}l(y_a, Y_c^*) = \mathcal{E}l(y_a, Y_d^*)
\end{aligned}
$$

Define $q = \mathcal{E}k(x_a, X_b^*)$, $p = \mathcal{E}l(y_a, Y_b^*)$. Therefore, after integration, the brown terms of the equation can be written as:

$$q4p + q4p + q4p + q(-2p - 2p) + q(-2p - 2p) + q(-2p - 2p) = 0$$

Similar reasoning shows that red, green and violet terms cancel out. □

Lemma 10. *Under* $\mathbf{H_0}$, h_2 *is a canonical kernel.*

Proof. Using Lemma 9 we simplify h_2

$$h_2(z_1, z_2) = \mathcal{E}h(z_1, z_2, Z_3^*, Z_4^*).$$

We check condition for kernel to be canonical

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}h_2(z_1, Z_2^*) = h_1(z_1) = 0. \\
\mathcal{E}h_2(Z_1^*, z_2) = h_1(z_2) = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Lemma 11. *Under* $\mathbf{H_0}$,

$$h_2(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{6}\tilde{k}(x_1, x_2)\tilde{l}(y_1, y_2)$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{k}(x_1, x_2) = k(x_1, x_2) - \mathcal{E}k(x_1, X_2) - \mathcal{E}k(X_1^*, x_2) + \mathcal{E}k(X_1^*, X_2^*) \\
\tilde{l}(y_1, y_2) = l(y_1, y_2) - \mathcal{E}l(y_1, Y_2) - \mathcal{E}l(Y_1^*, y_2) + \mathcal{E}l(Y_1^*, Y_2^*)
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We use Lemma 10 and exact form of $\mathcal{E}h(z_1, z_2, Z_3^*, Z_4^*)$ from (Gretton et al., 2008b), section A.2, text between equation 12 and 13. □

Corollary 2. *Under* $\mathbf{H_0}$, $h_2 = \frac{1}{6}s$.

Lemma 12. *Under* $\mathbf{H_0}$, h_3 *is a canonical kernel.*

Proof. Since $h_1 = 0$, we can write

$$h_3(z_1, z_2, z_3) = \mathcal{E}h(z_1, z_2, z_3, Z_4^*) - h_2(z_1, z_2) - h_2(z_1, z_3) - h_2(z_2, z_3) \tag{17}$$

Then we calculate $\mathcal{E}h_3(z_1, z_2, Z_3^*)$. Since $\mathcal{E}h(z_1, z_2, Z_3^*, Z_4^*) = h_2(z_1, z_2)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}h_3(z_1, z_2, Z_3^*) &= \mathcal{E}h(z_1, z_2, Z_3^*, Z_4^*) - \mathcal{E}h_2(z_1, z_2) - \mathcal{E}h_2(z_1, Z_3^*) - \mathcal{E}h_2(z_2, Z_3^*) = \\ &= h_2(z_1, z_2) - h_2(z_1, z_2) - h_1(z_1) - h_1(z_1) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Due to h_3 symmetry we obtain the required statement. □

Lemma 13. *Under* $\mathbf{H_0}$, h_4 *is canonical*

Proof. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}h_4(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) &= h(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) \\ &- h_2(z_1, z_2) - h_2(z_1, z_3) - h_2(z_1, z_4) - h_2(z_2, z_3) - h_2(z_2, z_4) - h_2(z_3, z_4) \\ &- h_3(z_1, z_2, z_3) - h_3(z_1, z_3, z_4) - h_3(z_1, z_2, z_4) - h_3(z_2, z_3, z_4)\end{aligned}$$

Choose $1 \leq o \leq 4$ and set i,j, p to three left out numbers. Next compute expected value of terms containing h_2, h_3 and h with Z_o^* . For h_2, modulo terms rearrangement, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{E}[-h_2(z_i, z_j) - h_2(z_i, Z_o^*) - h_2(z_i, z_p) \\ &- h_2(z_j, Z_o^*) - h_2(z_j, z_p) - h_2(Z_o^*, z_p)] = -h_2(z_i, z_j) - h_2(z_i, z_p) - h_2(z_j, z_p)\end{aligned}$$

For h_3 we get

$$\mathcal{E}[-h_3(z_i, z_j, Z_o^*) - h_3(z_i, Z_o^*, z_p) - h_3(z_i, z_j, z_p) - h_3(z_j, Z_o^*, z_p)] = -h_3(z_i, z_j, z_p)$$

For h we get from (17)

$$\mathcal{E}h(z_i, z_j, Z_o^*, z_p) = h_3(z_i, z_j, z_p) + h_2(z_i, z_j) + h_2(z_i, z_p) + h_2(z_j, z_p)$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{E}h_4(z_i, z_j, Z_o^*, z_p) = 0.$$

□

A.4. Proofs - $U(h_4, Z)$ and $U(h_3, Z)$ convergence to zero

Lemma 14. *If* $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}+}$ *is an absolutely regular process with mixing coefficient dying of faster then* n^{-3} *(*$\beta(n), \theta(n) \leq n^{-3}$*), then* $n \cdot U(h_4, Z))$ *and* $n \cdot U(h_3, Z))$ *converges to zero in probability.*

Proof. Let N be a set of first n numbers, $N = \{1, \cdots, n\}$ and B be a set of all strictly increasing 4-tuples, $B \subset N^4$. See that a U-statistics can be express as sum over elements of B

$$n \cdot U(h_4, Z)) = \left[\frac{1}{n^4}\binom{n}{4}^{-1}\right] \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in B} h_4(Z_b).$$

If variance of this random variable goes to zero

$$\lim_{n\to 0} \mathcal{E}\left(\frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in B} h_4(Z_b)\right)^2 \overset{P}{=} 0,$$

then using Chebyshev's inequality we can conclude that it converges to a constant in probability. To show that we use Lemma 3 from Arcones (1998). We see that the first condition of Theorem 1 from Arcones (1998) is met since h_4 is

bounded and the mixing coefficient coverages to zero. Therefore, by the fact that h_4 is canonical, we can use Lemma 3 from Arcones (1998) which states that

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in B} h_4(Z_b)\right)^2 \leq Cn^4 M(1+\sum_{m=1}^{n-1} m^3\beta(m)^{(p-2)/p}),$$

for some $p>2$ and $M = \| h \|_\infty$. Take p such that $\frac{3(p-2)}{p} = 2.5$ and use inequality $\beta(m) \leq m^{-3}$ to obtain

$$\sum_{m=1}^{n-1} m^3\beta(m)^{(p-2)/p} \leq \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\sqrt{m} = O(n^{1.5})$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{n\to 0}\mathcal{E}\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in B} h_4(Z_b)\right)^2 \overset{P}{=} \lim_{n\to 0}\frac{n^{5.5}}{n^6} \overset{P}{=} 0$$

.

Now we need to show that $\mathcal{E}nU(h_4, Z)$ converges to zero. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}nU(h_4,Z) &= \frac{n}{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)}\mathcal{E}\sum_{1\leq a<b<c<d\leq n} h_4(Z_a,Z_b,Z_c,Z_d) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{n}{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)}\sum_{1\leq a<b<c<d\leq n}\frac{1}{max(b-a,c-b,d-c)^2},\end{aligned}$$

we have used Lemma 4. Indeed, since h_4 is bounded we can make $\frac{\sigma}{1+\sigma}$ arbitrarily close to 1 and use fact that the mixing coefficient is smaller than n^{-3}. Now we simply calculate

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{1\leq a<b<c<d\leq n}\frac{1}{max(b-a,c-b,d-c)^2} &= \sum_{a=1}^{n-3}\sum_{d=a+3}^{n}\sum_{a<b<c<d}\frac{1}{max(b-a,c-b,d-c)^2} \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{a=1}^{n-3}\sum_{d=a+3}^{n}\frac{3^2}{(d-a)^2} \leq 9\sum_{a=1}^{n-3} 2\zeta(2) \leq Cn.\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

We have used the fact that $\sum_{d=a+3}^{n}\frac{1}{(d-a)^2} \leq 2\zeta(2)$.

The reasoning for $U(h_3, Z)$ is similar. □

A.5. Proofs - I. S. Borisov (2009, Theorem 1)

Theorem 3. *Let m be number of a symmetric kernel f arguments. Let one of the following two sets of conditions be fulfilled:*

1. *The stationary sequence X_i satisfies θ-mixing and*
   - 1.1. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\phi(k)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$,
   - 1.2. $\sup_i \mathcal{E}|e_i(X_1)|^2 < \infty$.
2. *The stationary sequence X_i satisfies α-mixing. For some $\epsilon > 0$ and for even number $c \geq 2$ the following holds*
   - 2.1. $\sup_i \mathcal{E}|e_i(X_1)|^{2+\epsilon} \leq \infty$,
   - 2.2. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{c-2}\alpha^{\epsilon/(c+\epsilon)}(k) < \infty$

where $e_i(X_1)$ are basis of $L_2(X,F)$. Then, for any degenerate kernel $f(t_1,...,t_m) \in L_2(X_m,F_m)$, under conditions

- $\sum_{i_1,...,i_m}^{\infty}|f_{i_1,...,i_m}| < \infty$, *where $f_{i_1,...,i_m}$ are f's coefficient in $L_2(X_m,F_m)$.*

- *For every collection of pairwise distinct subscripts* $(j_1, ..., j_m)$*, the distribution of* $(X_{j_1}, ..., X_{j_m})$ *is absolutely continuous with respect to the distribution of* $(X_1^*, ..., X_m^*)$*, where* X_i* *is an independent copy of* X_1*.*
- $e_0 = 1$ *or* $\mathcal{E}e_i(Z_j) = 0$ *for all* i*.*

the following assertion holds:

$$n^{\frac{m}{2}} U(f, Z) \to \sum_{i_1,...,i_m}^{\infty} f_{i_1,...,i_m} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} H_{\nu_j(i_1,...,i_m)}(\tau_j)$$

where , τ_j *is a centred Gaussian sequence with the covariance matrix defined as follows*

$$\mathcal{E}\tau_k\tau_l = \mathcal{E}e_k(X_1)e_l(X_1) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left[\mathcal{E}e_k(X_1)e_l(X_{j+1}) + \mathcal{E}e_l(X_1)e_k(X_{j+1})\right],$$

$\nu_j(i_1, ..., i_m) := \sum_{r=1}^{m} \delta_{j,i_r}$ *and* $H_k(x)$ *are Hermite polynomials defined by formula*

$$H_k(x) = (-1)^k e^{(x^2/2)} \frac{d^k}{dx^k}(e^{-x^2/2})$$

A.6. Proofs - Expected value of the eigen functions

From the eigenvalue equation $\lambda_i \mathcal{E}e_i(z) = \mathcal{E}h_2(z, Z_2^*)e_i(Z_2^*)$, h_2 degeneracy and Z_1^*, Z_2^* independence we conclude that

$$\mathcal{E}e_i(Z_1^*) = \frac{1}{\lambda_i}\mathcal{E}h_2(Z_1^*, Z_2^*)e_i(Z_2^*) = \frac{1}{\lambda_i}\mathcal{E}[e_i(Z_2^*)\mathcal{E}(h_2(Z_1^*, Z_2^*)|Z_2^* = z_2)] = \frac{1}{\lambda_i}\mathcal{E}[e_i(Z_2^*) \cdot 0] = 0.$$

References

A., Feuerverger. A consistent test for bivariate dependence. *International Statistical Review*, 61(3):419–433, 1993.

Arcones, M. The law of large numbers for u-statistics under absolute regularity. *Electronic Communications in Prob.*, 3 (0):13–19, April 1998.

Besserve, M., Logothetis, N., and Schlkopf, B. Statistical analysis of coupled time series with kernel cross-spectral density operators. pp. 2535–2543, 2013.

Bradley, Richard C. Basic properties of strong mixing conditions. a survey and some open questions. *Probability Surveys*, 2:107–144, 2005.

Broock, W. A., Scheinkman, J. A., Dechert, W. D., and LeBaron, B. A test for independence based on the correlation dimension. *Econometric Reviews*, 15(3):197–235, 1996.

Clive W. J. Granger, Esfandiar Maasoumi. A dependence metric for possibly nonlinear processes. *J. of Time Series Analysis*, 25(5):649–669, 2004.

Denker, Manfred and Keller, Gerhard. On u-statistics and v. mise statistics for weakly dependent processes. *Zeitschrift fr Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 64(4):505–522, December 1983.

Diks, C. and Panchenko, V. Nonparametric tests for serial independence based on quadratic forms. Tinbergen Inst. Discussion Paper 05-076/1, Tinbergen Institute, 2005.

Doukhan, P. Mixing. properties and examples. In *Mixing*, number 85 in Lect. Notes in Stat., pp. 87–109. Springer, January 1994.

Fadlallah, B., Brockmeier, A., Seth, S., Li, L., Keil, A., and Prncipe, J. An association framework to analyze dependence structure in time series. *Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society.*, 2012:6176–6179, 2012.

Gretton, A. and Gyorfi, L. Consistent nonparametric tests of independence. *J. of Machine Learning Research*, 11:1391–1423, 2010.

Gretton, A., Bousquet, O., Smola, A., and Schlkopf, B. Measuring statistical dependence with hilbert-schmidt norms. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, number 3734 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pp. 63–77. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, January 2005.

Gretton, A., Borgwardt, K., Rasch, M., Scholkopf, B., and Smola, A. A kernel method for the two-sample problem. arXiv e-print 0805.2368, May 2008a.

Gretton, A., Fukumizu, K., Teo, C., Song, L., Schlkopf, B., and Smola, A. A kernel statistical test of independence. Technical report, 2008b.

Gretton, A, Borgwardt, K, Rasch, M, Schlkopf, B, and Smola, A. A kernel two-sample test. *J. of Machine Learning Research*, 13:723773, 2012.

Haugh, Larry D. Checking the independence of two covariance-stationary time series: A univariate residual cross-correlation approach. *J. of the American Statistical Association*, 71(354):378–385, June 1976.

Hoeffding, W. The strong law of large numbers for u-statistic. *Inst. Statist. University of North Carolina Mimeograph Series*, 302, 1961.

Hong, Yongmiao. Testing for independence between two covariance stationary time series. *Biometrika*, 83(3):615–625, September 1996.

Hong, Yongmiao and White, Halbert. Asymptotic distribution theory for nonparametric entropy measures of serial dependence. In *Measures of Serial Dependence Unpublished Manuscript*, pp. 837901, 2004.

Hyvärinen, A., Karhunen, J., and Oja, E. *Independent Component Analysis*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 2001.

I. S. Borisov, N. Volodko. Orthogonal series and limit theorems for canonical u- and v-statistics of stationary connected observations. 2009.

Pearl, J. *Causality: Models, Reasoning and Inference*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Pinkse, J. Consistent nonparametric test for serial independence. *J. of Econometrics*, 84(2):205–231, June 1998.

Racine, J. and Maasoumi, E. A versatile and robust metric entropy test of time-reversibility, and other hypotheses. *J. of Econometrics*, 138(2):547–567, 2007.

Robinson, P. M. Consistent nonparametric entropy-based testing. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 58(3):437–453, May 1991.

Rosenblatt, M. and Wahlen, B. A nonparametric measure of independence under a hypothesis of independent components. *Stat. & Prob. Letters*, 15(3):245–252, October 1992.

Serfling, Robert J. *Approximation theorems of mathematical statistics*. Wiley, New York, 2002.

Shao, Xiaofeng. a generalized portmanteau test for independence between two stationary time series. *Econometric Theory*, 25(01):195–210, 2009.

Smola, Alex. Kernel measures of independence for non-iid data. 2008.

Song, L., Smola, A., Gretton, A., Bedo, J., and Borgwardt, K. Feature selection via dependence maximization. *J. of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*, 13:1393–1434, 2012.

Sriperumbudur, B., Gretton, A., Fukumizu, K., Lanckriet, G., and Schlkopf, B. Injective hilbert space embeddings of probability measures. In *In COLT*, 2008.

Steinwart, I. and Scovel, C. Mercers theorem on general domains: On the interaction between measures, kernels, and RKHSs. *Constructive Approximation*, 35(3):363–417, February 2012.

Székely, G. and Rizzo, M. Brownian distance covariance. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(3):1233–1303, 2009.

Yoshihara, Ken-ichi. Limiting behavior of u-statistics for stationary, absolutely regular processes. *Zeitschrift fr Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 35(3):237–252, September 1976.